



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1080/10286630500411309](https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630500411309)

Document Version

Early version, also known as pre-print

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Lee, H-K. (2005). When arts met marketing: Arts marketing theory embedded in Romanticism. *International journal of cultural policy*, 11(3), 289-305. [N/A]. [10.1080/10286630500411309](https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630500411309)

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

WHEN ARTS MET MARKETING: ARTS MARKETING THEORY EMBEDDED IN ROMANTICISM

* Forthcoming in the *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 11, No. 3 (2005) *

Hye-Kyung Lee

Cultural and Creative Industries, School of Humanities, King's College London,
Strand, London WC2R 2LS, UK

INTRODUCTION

Contemporary literature on British arts policy and management tends to conceptualise the institutional change in the non-profit arts sector since the 1980s as “marketisation” (Bennett, 1996; Gray, 2000; McGuigan, 1996; Quinn, 1998).¹ Although there exist different opinions on whether public arts subsidy has actually reduced and to what extent it has been replaced by private money, the literature agrees that a fundamental cultural change has occurred in the sector. That is, arts organisations have adopted new governing ideologies and managerial practices so that they can think and function as if they were for-profit businesses. The proliferation of arts marketing is regarded as a good example of the penetration of market reasoning into the arts world (Bennett, 1996, p. 11). Marketing is understood as helping organisations to detach from their old values and practices and reorient themselves around *market* needs, and such a view seems to be shared by both advocates and critics of arts marketing.

However, arts marketing practice has been observed as not being very far from the traditional idea of audience development, which aims at broadening public accessibility to the arts. As Lewis (1990) and Kawashima (2000) argue, it tends to employ the “product-led” rather than the “market-led” approach. Practitioners’ views of arts marketing may give us a hint of their primary sympathy towards the product: “the Product is sacrosanct (it must be shaped by the artist and the artistic team and it should be protected from market forces)”; and “marketing...is selling the director’s vision to the world” (Wadeson in Arts Marketing Association, 2004, p. 77 and my interview with a marketing manager in an English regional arts marketing agency). Some people would try to explain this by saying that there always exists a gap between theory and practice and arts marketing is not an exception. However, it should be pointed out that the product orientation in arts marketing is actually backed up by

its *theory*.

This paper proposes that arts marketing theory has been constructed within the existing context of the non-profit arts sector, such as the Romantic belief in the value of the arts and in “producer authority” over the consumer. In order to demonstrate the “embeddedness” of the arts marketing theory in Romanticism, this paper examines arts (including museum) marketing manuals, textbooks and articles that have been available to arts organisations in Britain since the 1970s. First, it is shown that during the 1970s and 1980s, marketing in the arts context was conceptualised as “a set of techniques” and “a decision-making process” that could be utilised for arts organisations to reach a wider public. Second, the paper points out that recent recognition of arts marketing as “a management philosophy” sheds light on tensions between the customer orientation of the marketing notion and the Romantic view of artistic production. However, it is soon found that arts marketing writings try to reconcile these two different perspectives by adopting modified definitions of marketing itself, the market and the product, and also by reducing the role of marketing to a mere function. This is followed by a discussion of the implications of the findings on our understanding of marketisation in the arts sector.

NON-PROFIT ARTS, ROMANTICISM AND MARKETING?

The British non-profit arts sector has developed under the auspices of state subsidy since the Second World War. Public funding was justified by citing the “civilising” and “educational” values of the arts, and this led most non-profit arts organisations to be constituted as “educational charities”. It was within this context that John Maynard Keynes, the economist and first chairman of the Arts Council, said,

We look forward to the time when the theatre and the concert-hall and the gallery will be a living element in everyone’s upbringing, and regular attendance at the theatre and at concerts a part of organised education. (Keynes, 1945)

As Bennett (1996) observes, the intellectual framework for cultural policy evolved out of the Romantic perspective of the arts, which was developed by English Romantic poets such as Blake, Wordsworth and Shelley around the turn of the nineteenth century and was shared by artists in other disciplines. In fact, Romanticism is difficult to define as it includes a wide range of ideas and practices such as opposition to the mimetic theory of the arts, celebration of free expression of the imagination, emphasis on the authenticity of the emotions, adoption of new subjects such as natural and wild landscapes, and development of personal and intimate styles (Honour, 1981; Shiner, 2001; Vaughan, 1994). Nonetheless, in arts policy and management context, it can be understood as a new attitude to the arts and artists. First the

Romantic artists idealised the arts as a realm where truth and ideal were explored. The arts were no longer simply skilful activities that served social, religious or commercial purposes. Instead they were viewed as a means of recovering human values depleted by commercialism and the material progress of society and even a practicable mode of access to the ideal of human perfection (Williams, 1982, pp. 39-42). This idea was further developed in Mathew Arnold's theory of "Culture": culture as "the great help out of anarchy" that could re-impose social order and drive individuals and society into a perfect state (Arnold, 1993). Arnold held that culture could be achieved by means of reading, observing and thinking in an effort to know the best that can be known, which reinforced the belief that the mass public could be enlightened by exposure to the arts. Second, the Romantics elevated the status of artists to that of "geniuses", "prophets", "the unacknowledged legislators of the world" or "agents of the revolution of life". Artists' creativity, imagination, originality and sincerity were highly praised and regarded as the very source of greatness in art works. As the German Romantic painter Friedrich said, "The artist should not only paint what he sees before him, but also what he sees within him" (cited in Vaughan, 1994, pp. 24-25). In order to explore the truth, the argument went, artists should express their innermost feeling and inspiration free from any external forces. The market, now the most influential patron of the arts, was generally deemed a threat and it was believed that, if artists pursued market success, this would be at the cost of their own genius.

Such a view was strongly supported by the post-war British government and the Arts Council. With the assumption that the arts had universal values, they identified one of the primary aims of arts policy as being the dissemination of the arts to people, and this was conceptualised as "the best for the most" (Redcliffe-Maud, 1976). While the autonomy of artists was taken for granted as a prerequisite to artistic production, the role of the public was by and large confined to enjoying art works presented to them. If they did not, they needed to be further encouraged, persuaded and educated. It is because their "deprivation [of the arts]...is usually the result of their education and environment.... [and] Most people do not know how to get into cultural swim" (Shaw, 1987, pp. 118-120). Therefore, one of the most important issues for arts policy and management has been how to remove the geographical, psychological, economic and educational barriers that prevent people from consuming the arts.

On the contrary, marketing provides a very different perspective on the relation between the arts and the public. The core of the marketing concept is "market (or customer) orientation", a management attitude which holds that production should not merely be conscious of market needs, but it should also start from them (Baker, 1994; Dalgic, 2000; Kotler, 1976; Kotler et al., 1996). That is, an organisation should produce what its customers really need rather than struggling to sell what it can produce. This orientation is often compared with product or sales orientation. The "product orientation" refers to a tendency that an organisation produces what it can produce and what it thinks is valuable in the belief that consumers will respond

positively to a good product. Meanwhile, a “sales-driven” organisation believes that consumers will normally not buy enough of a product unless there is a substantial selling and promotion effort made by the company. Marketing theory argues that today market-driven management is *the* precondition for organisational survival and success as customer preferences are becoming more sophisticated and are also changing very rapidly. Baker (1994) describes what marketing is all about:

Marketing starts with the market and the consumer. It recognizes that in a consumer democracy money votes are cast daily and that to win those votes you need to offer either a better product at the same price or the same product at a lower price than your competitors. Price is objective and tangible but what is ‘a better product’? Only one person can tell you – the consumer. (p. 8)

As such marketing provides not only a management strategy for individual organisations but also an ideological framework. It asserts the democratic character of a market transaction over other means of social interaction: the market is seen as giving power to people by ensuring their right to voluntarily choose what they want (Frank, 2000). Through the market, individuals and organisations, as rational interest-seekers, are deemed to maximise their own utility through freely creating, offering and exchanging products of values with others. It is also supposed that the market transaction allocates resources in society most efficiently because it gives people the maximum information and incentives.

Obviously, there exists an inevitable tension between the marketing concept and the Romantic idea of the arts. From the marketing perspective, value is “completely subjective and exists in the eyes of the beholding market” (Kotler, 1972, p. 50), and this may also be the case in the arts. Individual consumers, as “sovereign” actors, are seen as the best arbitrators of value in arts products; they have a right to choose or reject the products according to their own tastes and preferences, which they know best. Therefore, asserting the general value of certain kinds of arts and claiming public accessibility to them is likely to be perceived as a paternalistic and producer-led approach. Similarly, arts organisations’ efforts to attract a larger audience to already created products may be criticised as a sales-driven management.

However, it was not until the 1990s that the theoretical incompatibility between marketing and the Romantic view on arts production, producer authority over the market in particular, came to the forefront. It is because during the two previous decades, arts marketing was generally perceived as a managerial function rather than an organisational orientation, as we shall see in the following section.

UNDERSTANDING OF ARTS MARKETING IN THE PAST

The 1970s: Marketing as a Set of Techniques

The 1970s saw the introduction of the notion of marketing to the non-profit arts sector. Marketing, as “a collection of techniques” that could be easily transferred from the commercial sector, was generally seen as a helpful way of widening the social composition of the audience as well as increasing ticket sales. This is why the Arts Council began to be involved with arts marketing activities and encouraged the Regional Arts Associations to consider the appointment of regionally based marketing officers. As Diggle’s *Marketing the Arts* (1976) shows, the starting point of arts marketing was to acknowledge the authority and autonomy of artists:

the end product is what the artist decides it will be....The essential freedom of the artist...is what makes the product worth marketing in the first place....The marketers of the Arts do not allow themselves to be satisfied with giving people what they like; they also want to persuade those people to like more and to increase generally the body of people to whom the Arts have meaning and value. (pp. 10-11)

The job of a marketer, as a “middle-man” between artists and audience, was concerned with the “way” in which artistic products would be brought before a paying audience (pp. 5-9). Consequently, most of Diggle’s book was devoted to explaining specific marketing functions (e.g. market research, producing, advertising, promotion, pricing, merchandising, distribution and financial planning). The perspective that saw marketing as a technique was also found in the marketing projects in Sheffield, Bristol and Birmingham between 1973 and 1976, which were funded by the Arts Council. The projects concerned the setting up of regional marketing agencies to examine ways in which the arts within the given communities would become more accessible. Here, marketing techniques such as market research, advertising, promotion and sales were experimented with (Arts Council of Great Britain, 1976).

Interestingly, a similar understanding of marketing is also found in the for-profit arts sector. A marketing proposal entitled *Ready for the Eighties?* (Burke, 1980), published by the Society of West End Theatres,² is an example. This report addressed the importance of an aggressive marketing approach in theatre management. However, its notion of marketing was no more than “methods of selling a product”, which involved public relations, informing the public, joint promotion, advertising and cooperation with the tourism industry.

The 1980s: Marketing as a Process

The 1980s saw the non-profit arts sector's increasing interest in the use of marketing. Under the Conservative government's threat of funding cuts and calls for self-help and a commercial mentality in arts organisations, marketing's focus on customers as the starting point of business was suggested as the alternative to the traditional attitude of the arts sector that saw the audience as passive recipients. As discussed in detail elsewhere (Lee, 2005), the diffusion of marketing was initially driven by the arts funding system under the encouragement of government. The first half of the 1980s saw the Arts Council begin to provide its clients with market data such as ACORN³ and the creation of the Marketing and Resource Department to give advice and help on marketing and audience development. During the three years from 1988/89, the Council's "incentive awards" were distributed to improve marketing skills and resources of arts organisations, as well as enhance their capacity for efficient management and sponsorship development.

In spite of the rapid growth in demand for arts marketing under the marketisation policy, this period witnessed relatively slow progress in its theorisation. While there were arts marketing texts produced by marketing academics in the US (e.g. Mokwa, Dawson & Prieve, 1980), their British counterparts were supplied in the form of practical guides mainly by the arts funding system. What was noticeable from the guides was that arts marketing began to be perceived as a systematic "process" of organisational management as well as a set of techniques (Robbins & Verwey, 1982; Wyatt, 1983). For instance, *The TMA Marketing Manual* (Robbins & Verwey, 1982),⁴ an important source of arts marketing in the 1980s, defined marketing as

A co-ordinated process [italics added] which makes the best use of available resources to present a product proposition to a target market in order to achieve objectives – and then evaluating how successfully this has been done. (p. 1)

The manual suggested "six basic principles" of the process: "taking account of resources", "agreeing objectives", "product positioning", "deciding target market", "marketing action" and "evaluation" (p. 1). Nonetheless, it was also keen on spreading knowledge about a wide range of marketing techniques so theatres could use them according to individual situations. Thus, most of the three volumes of the manual (a total of 650 pages) were dedicated to explaining them. The understanding of marketing as a decision-making process was supported by writings produced in the second half of the 1980s (Greater London Arts, 1989; Maitland & Meddick, 1990; Rodger, 1987). Maitland and Meddick (1990), in a marketing manual published by the Arts Council, insisted that marketing was "a particularly effective way of approaching the work your organisation wants to do" and "a clear way of prioritising tasks and discarding those which do not give a good return" (p. 7). As a "a series of logical steps" in decision-making, marketing activity generally consisted of the following elements: setting

organisational objectives; SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis; audience analysis; setting marketing objectives; setting targets; deciding means to achieve the targets; implementation; and evaluation.

In marketing theory, the marketing process aims at realising market orientation through identifying, anticipating and satisfying customer needs. Arts marketing guides of the 1980s, however, scarcely considered market orientation in their discussion of the process, and this helped marketing to be squared with the non-profit arts context. Nonetheless, the second half of the decade also witnessed the beginning of a new approach to arts marketing, in which heavy emphasis is given to the role of marketing as a “philosophy” (e.g. Rodger, 1987).

ANALYSIS OF ARTS MARKETING THEORY

Marketing as an Organisational Philosophy

The period since the 1990s has observed a remarkable development in arts marketing. The place of marketing has become consolidated through its institutionalisation in individual arts organisations (e.g. the establishment of marketing departments), the proliferation of arts marketing experts and consultants, and the expansion of relevant training courses, seminars and conferences (e.g. those provided by the Arts Marketing Association). Also, there has been an increasing supply of marketing manuals by arts funding bodies (Arts Council England, 2003; Arts Council of Wales, 2000; Maitland, 1995; Scottish Arts Council, 2001).

Marketing academics have shown their interest in the application of marketing to the arts and cultural sector, and some of them view this as a branch of non-profit marketing (Butler, 2000; Kotler & Kotler, 1998, 1999; Sargeant, 1999; Scheff & Kotler, 1996). Now marketing in the arts context tends to be defined as “arts marketing” with a complete logic of theory rather than a mere “use of marketing for the arts”.

Such developments started from criticism of the existing approach’s attention to only the functional elements of marketing. For instance, Hill, O’Sullivan and O’Sullivan (1995, p. xii) argue that “up to now the focus...has tended to be tactical, concentrating on particular areas of marketing technique (such as pricing and promotion) rather than on a holistic account”. Recent writings draw our attention to the very essence of marketing, i.e. market orientation, and the role of marketing as “a guiding philosophy” of an organisation. Now arts organisations are encouraged to view themselves from the customer’s perspective and put customer needs at the heart of their decision-making. It is expected that a product should be created based upon what customers genuinely demand, and be deliberately combined with price, place and promotion in order to maximise customer satisfaction.

Interestingly, it is at this stage that arts marketing writers face the theoretical incompatibility between the marketing concept and the Romantic view of artistic production

and some explicitly show uneasiness towards the direct application of market orientation to the arts. The contradiction is the very issue that was discussed, as early as in 1983, in Hirschman's influential article "Aesthetics, ideologues and the limits of the marketing concept". Based upon the Romantic idea that artists "create primarily to express their subject conceptions of beauty, emotion or some other aesthetic ideal", she argued that marketing theory should recognise the specificity of artistic production (p. 46). That is, artists may "first create a product...and then present this product to consumers who choose to either accept or reject it" (p. 47). The issue raised by Hirschman has been widely shared by subsequent arts marketing literature. For instance, O'Sullivan (1997) suggests,

In a very real sense the arts remain and perhaps need to remain "producer-led" in apparent contradiction to the central tenet of marketing as a body of theory and a management practice. Perhaps there is a need to acknowledge here the limits of marketing, as Hirschman (1983) has argued. (p. 142)

In a similar vein, Bhrádaigh (1997, p. 208) confesses "The major difficulty [in a transfer of marketing to the arts sector]...resides in the central marketing notion that products are created to suit the customers". In a nutshell, arts marketing as a philosophy faces an inevitable "orientational dilemma" in which market orientation needs to be enacted, if arts marketing is to be marketing, while producer autonomy and value of the arts should be also protected (Andreasen, 1985).

Five Approaches to Solving the Orientational Dilemma

How does arts marketing theory settle the orientational dilemma? An analysis of arts marketing writings has found that they adopt a number of different but mutually non-exclusive approaches: (a) the generic marketing concept; (b) the relationship marketing approach; (c) an extended definition of the market; (d) an extended definition of the product; and (e) the reduction of marketing to function. In the following sections, each approach is explored in detail.

(a) The generic marketing concept

Many arts marketing writings tend to negate the orientational dilemma by adopting "generic" marketing concept, the softened concept of marketing. In 1969, Kotler and Levy first argued for the relevance of marketing to all types of organisations in society by broadening its meaning to "sensitively serving and satisfying human needs". Since then, generic marketing has gained currency and this has led to an abundance of modified definitions of marketing such as "transactions between any two parties", "exchange of values", "human exchange relationships", "achieving organisational objectives", "influencing behaviour" and

“fundamental human process” (Kotler, 1972; Kotler & Andreasen, 1991, p. 404; Mokwa, Nakamoto & Eris, 1980, p. 28; Sargeant, 1999, pp. 11, 259). Equipped with a generic definition, marketing began to claim its “universal” application to any organisation that involves social interactions (Bagozzi, 1980).

As an application of generic marketing, arts marketing is able to avoid being directly interpreted as identifying and satisfying customer needs. Many writings define marketing as “value exchanges” between an arts organisation and its consumers. For example, it is supposed that the customers get aesthetic, social and psychological benefits from their visit to the organisation at the expense of their time, money and energy; meanwhile, the organisation obtains income, recognition and emotional support from the visitors at the cost of its artistic and managerial efforts and expenditure. The notion of exchange has been welcomed because it emphasises a two-way and mutually beneficial transaction between two actors and allows an arts organisation not to necessarily sacrifice its artistic mission in order to satisfy customer needs.

The generic account of the marketing perspective tends to permit further modification of the marketing concept. For instance, Kotler et al. (1996, pp. 18-20) proposes the “societal” marketing concept. According to them, an organisation which aims to maintain or improve the consumer’s and the society’s well being should take the producer-led approach and determine the needs, wants and interests of target markets. It is because their customers often do not know what is needed for their long-term benefits and welfare. Sympathetic to this interpretation of marketing, Boorsma (2002) and Butler (2000) see arts marketing as societal activity and place a heavy emphasis on the equal distribution of the arts among the public particularly through transforming non-attenders into an arts audience.

(b) The relationship marketing approach

Some arts marketing literature turns its attention to “relationship marketing”, a notion that has developed in service industries since the 1980s (Buttle, 1996; Grönroos, 1989; Hill, O’Sullivan & O’Sullivan, 1995; O’Sullivan, 1997; Rentschler et al., 2002). While criticising existing marketing for limiting itself to a technical implementation of the marketing mix for one-off transactions, relationship marketing maintains that the core of marketing activity should be to develop a long-term relationship with customers. Such an approach is assumed to be more economical than transactional marketing: to retain an existing customer costs less than to win a new one; and the longer the association between a company and its customer the more profitable the relationship for the firm (Buttle, 1996). Writers from this perspective hold that arts organisations, as service providers, should view marketing activities from human relationships:

If the relationship marketing approach is to be adopted as a strategic option by an arts organisation, it

is important that the marketing officer involved bears in mind the kind of qualities that are associated with everyday human relationships – mutuality, emotional investment, trust, concern for the other's long-term interest, giving priority to the other's needs – and endeavour to apply those values in the planning, creation and implementation of effective marketing programmes (O'Sullivan, 1997, p. 145).

It is supposed that an arts organisation can develop and maintain a mutually satisfactory relationship with its customers even if it is not purely market-led, through personalised customer services, provision of incentives or improvement of mutual knowledge. As the relationship progresses, customers are expected to go through a ladder of loyalty, for instance from single-ticket purchasers to repeat customers and finally to advocates (Rentschler et al., 2002). Here, organisational focus is placed on audience retention rather than on continuously seeking new audiences. In this sense, the relationship approach seems to contradict the societal interpretation of arts marketing.

(c) The extended definition of the customer

In order to allow market orientation to make sense in the arts context, some writings adopt an extended definition of “customer”. This approach, too, is backed up by the mainstream marketing literature. For instance, Kotler and Levy (1969) interpret consumers as many groups that are interested in an organisation's products and can make a difference in its success. The word “public” is often used to refer to a wide range of customers such as supporters, employees, suppliers, agents, consumers (buyers), government, competitors, special publics and general publics. Similarly, arts marketing writings suggest that customers of an arts organisation include peer artists, critics and funding bodies as well as a paying audience (Bhrádaigh, 1997; Butler, 2000; Hill, O'Sullivan & O'Sullivan, 1995; Hirschman, 1983; Sargeant, 1999, pp. 15-18). Even the definition of customer is broadened to include *artists themselves*. For instance, Hirschman (1983) argues,

The term “audience” or “consumer” is extended beyond the public at large and even beyond the notion of external parties (e.g. peers, critics) to the realization that some marketing exchanges are initiated within one's self. In self-oriented marketing, *the creator* [italics added] may serve as the initial consumer of that which he/she creates (p. 49).

For Hirschman, meeting the needs of arts producers themselves is most important to the creation of an art work, and then efforts to satisfy their peers and critics are likely to follow. Nonetheless, she defines this as a market-driven approach as producers are initial customers of their own works. Meanwhile, some writers use the notion of “multiple constituencies” or “associates” to refer to all those who support an organisation, such as public funding bodies, local authorities, grant-making trusts/foundations, educational establishments, press/media, customers for ancillary services (e.g. catering, space hire and costumes), business sponsors, friends/members, and trustees/governors of the arts organisation (Hill, O'Sullivan &

O'Sullivan, 1995, pp. 25-27; Sargeant, 1999; 15-18). With the extended definition of the customer, an arts organisation can be viewed as market-oriented even if it is more concerned with the constituencies other than actual and potential paying audiences.

(d) The extended definition of the product

Some writings attempt to grasp the original meaning of market orientation and demonstrate that arts products can actually be changed and modified to meet market needs (Bhrádaigh, 1997; Boorsma, 2002; Kolb, 2000; Kotler & Kotler, 1998, 1999; McLean, 1997). Their theoretical manoeuvre is to widen the definition of the “product”. This approach is supported by Kotler (1976), who categorises product into “tangible” (the physical entity or service), “extended” (the tangible product along with the whole cluster of services that accompany it) and “generic” product (the essential benefit or problem-solving, for example, beauty, joy, cleanness or comfort). Similar to the generic product concept, arts products tend to be understood as “the total package of experience” including an evening’s entertainment, a learning experience, a social experience, a yearly ritual and/or an adventurous event (Kolb, 2000, pp. 78-79). Kotler and Kotler (1998, 1999) also identify the museum product with multiple experiences of museum going, which include recreation, sociability, learning, an aesthetic experience, a celebrative experience and an enchanting experience.

Arts marketing literature maintains that all kind of arts experiences can be provided by the arts organisation *without* changing its “core” products such as actual performances or exhibitions. Then, how can customers’ experience be enhanced and their satisfaction maximised? The answer is that it is made possible by altering and modifying “augmented (secondary or peripheral)” products, which complement or facilitate consumption of the core activities (McLean, 1997, p. 107). Augmented products include accessibility to the car park, ease of access to the building, cleanliness of the facilities, hospitality of the staff, quality of the catering services, gift items, ease of booking, signage, etc. In short, customer orientation is applied only to those augmented products while core products remain intact:

arts organisations do not have to be reluctant to adapt parts of the total art product or service offering to the needs of consumers, as long as the core part of the artistic process can take place autonomously (Boorsma, 2002, p. 67).

Marketing of culture and arts needs to safeguard the core product, while modifying the non-core elements of the augmented product (Bhrádaigh, 1997, p. 208).

the product is the total package of experience....All of these can be provided by the cultural organisation without changing the cultural product. What would change would be the way the cultural product is communicated, presented and packaged (Kolb, 2000, pp. 78-79).

(e) (Re)reduction of marketing to function

Interestingly, some arts marketing writings see marketing itself as being in conflict with the achievement of artistic mission. Their idea is that arts organisations have two different aims – to fulfil artistic vision and to satisfy market needs – and the job of arts marketers is to seek a “reconciliation” or “balance” between them. For instance, Scheff and Kotler (1996, p. 38) suggest that arts marketers should explore and discover a harmonious balance between arts- and market-centred perspectives, a mix that benefits both arts organisations and their customers. Sargeant (1999) also observes,

it seems clear that there is an inherent conflict here between the marketing concept on the one hand and the whole ethos of the arts on the other....There is clearly, therefore, a need to reconcile these two extremes of opinion and to strike some form of balance between the preferences of audiences on the other hand, and the needs of those producing the arts on the other (pp. 164-165).

Meanwhile, some writings see marketing as only a means of achieving an organisation’s artistic missions (Butler, 2000; Diggle, 1994; McLean, 1993, 1997; also Scheff & Kotler, 1996). For museum marketing, McLean (1997) suggests that marketing be specific to fit in the “museum context” that has been constructed over time depending on the nature of collection, museum building, human resources and its relationship with the public. According to her, marketing is “merely an orientation within a museum which sets out to achieve the museum’s mission using a variety of practical tools” (p. 40). She defines this type of marketing as a “marketing-led” approach which can be distinguished from its “market-led” counterpart. Similarly, Kotler and Kotler (1998, p. 60) maintain that, in practice, the role of marketing is limited to functional use:

Marketing’s role has to be seen as one of supporting a museum’s objectives....Marketing is *a set of tools and a process* [italics added] wrapped in a philosophy that assists an organization in achieving its objectives....Marketing staff have an advisory role when professional staff formulate program offering. In the areas of designing communications, promoting offerings, and communicating with audiences, marketing staff have more weight in the decision-making process (p. 322).

The frequent emphasis on the “neutrality” of marketing supports the role of arts marketing as a function. According to Rodger (1987, p. 9), “Marketing, like energy, is a neutral force which can be used to good or ill effect. The morality or ethic of marketing lies not in the activity but in the use”. The neutrality was initially promoted to legitimatise the generality and transferability of marketing concept as a business philosophy. Ironically, it also implies that, in reality, marketing is a management function that is common to both commercial and non-commercial organisations. The following table summarises five different approaches found in arts marketing writings, which attempt to reconcile marketing and the producer orientation of artistic production.

Five approaches in arts marketing writings

	Generic marketing	Relationship marketing	Extended definition of the customer	Extended definition of product	Mission vs. marketing function
Andreasen (1985)				♦ core and peripheral	
Bhrádaigh (1997)			♦ artist, peers and the public	♦ core and augmented	
Boorsma (2002)	♦ exchange, societal activity			♦ core and augmented	
Butler (2000)	♦ Societal activity		♦ the public, public funders and critics		♦ arts context (arts first)
Colbert (2001)*					♦ product orientation
Diggle (1994)*					♦ arts first
Hill, O'Sullivan & O'Sullivan (1995)*	♦ exchange	♦	♦ associates (all those who support the organisation)	♦ core, extended and potential	
Hirschman (1983)			♦ artist, peers and the public		
Kolb (2000)*	♦ exchange			♦ core and augmented	
Kotler & Kotler (1998*, 1999)	♦ exchange			♦ core and augmented	♦ mission first
McLean (1993, 1997*)	♦ exchange	♦		♦ core and augmented	♦ museum context, balance between museum and marketing
Mokwa, Dawson & Prieve (1980)*	♦ exchange			♦ core and augmented	♦ balance between arts and the market
O'Sullivan (1997)	♦ exchange	♦			
Rectschler et al. (2002)	♦ exchange	♦	♦ customers and shareholders		
Rodger (1987)*	♦ exchange				♦ marketing is neutral
Sargeant (1999)	♦ exchange, satisfaction of social needs		♦ multiple constituencies		♦ balance between mission and marketing
Scheff & Kotler (1996)					♦ balance between arts and the market

*arts (or museum) marketing textbooks.

Compromise and Contradiction

Arts marketing writers' explicit sympathy towards producer orientation seems to be grounded upon their belief that the arts have an intrinsic value that is essential to the ultimate development of the human being and is best achieved when art works embody the creative, original and innovative intentions of their producers. The frequent quotation of Maslow's "hierarchy of human needs" might reflect such an attitude. The psychologist Abraham Maslow (1970) has argued that when basic human needs for food, security, belonging and love are met, people are motivated to fulfil their needs for self-esteem and then for self-actualisation. Arts marketing literature supposes that the arts are an important element of self-actualisation, the highest human needs because they provide people with "transcendent experiences" and "elevate the spirit, enlarge thought and feeling, stretch the imagination, and offer enchanting experience" (Kotler & Kotler, 1998, p. 5). Some writers argue that arts experiences offer satisfactions of all lower levels of human needs in addition to the need for self-realisation (Hill, O'Sullivan & O'Sullivan, 1995, pp. 119-121; Kolb, 2000, pp. 118-121). In order to maximise people's benefits from the arts, the literature commonly acknowledges that producers should not pander to capricious market demands and have "a right to hang on the eternal verities" (Lewis, 1994). Hence, Butler (2000) argues,

artists are the ultimate manifestation of that absolute insult in the marketing schoolyard, namely the "product orientation". But their internal focus, that total commitment to their artistic endeavour, is what makes them artists. (p. 359)

Conclusively, the goal of arts marketers is seen as to "find consumers who are likely to appreciate the product" (Colbert, 2001, p. 15) and develop a good relationship with them. Another important goal is to nurture people who are currently indifferent to the arts into becoming arts consumers. As for this group, the marketers attempt to convince them that they have hidden needs for the arts, even though the needs – identified by the marketers – are a long way from their real preferences, and then to encourage them to fulfil these needs.

However, it should be noted that such compromise between the marketing perspective and Romanticism tends to cause a contradiction in arts marketing narratives. Brown's (2002) account of the logic of marketing clearly illustrates why such contradiction is inescapable:

does what remains after the abjuration of customer orientation still count as marketing? Many would maintain that it comprises a reversion to sales- or production-orientation. Clearly, there is a tautological element in all this, since you cannot have one (marketing) without the other (customer orientation). The option of being a non-customer oriented "marketing" organisation is precluded on principle, if not practice (p. 320).

Logical or tautological confusion in arts marketing shows up conspicuously often when the writings justify the need for marketing with its focus on customer needs. As Butler (2000,

p. 359) observes, the notion of market orientation, triumphing over product or sales orientation, is well established in the opening section of many arts marketing writings, in particular when they criticise existing marketing approaches. It is likely to be followed by the argument that marketing should not only be a function but also an organisational philosophy. However, the relevance of market orientation to arts production is often questioned or even denied. Alternatively, it is applied to augmented products only. Finally, marketing comes to be suggested as a neutral function (not a philosophy) if not a counterforce against artistic endeavour.

An example is found in Andreassen's article "Marketing or selling the arts: An orientational dilemma" (1985). According to him, arts organisations tend to believe that the major reason they do not have greater sales or attendance is that consumers simply do not fully appreciate what a truly stimulating and enriching experience awaits them. He argues that the problem is the organisations' ignorance of market needs and their sales-led strategies and that they genuinely require a marketing concept. At the end of the paper, however, he too comes to a sales- or product-centred conclusion: only peripheral products can be modified to maximise customer satisfaction, or, alternatively, marketers can sometimes change customers' wants.

CULTURAL PERSISTENCE AND THE EMBEDDEDNESS OF THE MARKET

This paper has examined the arts marketing literature and has argued that Romanticism has set the very framework upon which arts marketing theory is formulated. Although there exists a fundamental conflict between the marketing concept and product orientation of the arts world, arts marketing writings have tried to resolve it in a number of ways, not without inconsistency in its narrative.

The findings of this paper provide some implications for our understanding of marketisation of the arts. The boundedness of arts marketing theory to Romanticism suggests that marketisation might not be a clear-cut cultural change, which is often characterised as a one-sided permeation of market values and logics into the arts (e.g. McGuigan, 1996). Rather, it can be understood as a complicated process of the "persistence" of the existing culture in the arts sector and its "negotiation" with the market ideology. The Romantic view of arts production, which has prescribed the attitude and behaviour of both arts organisations and the arts funding system for a long time, is relatively stable because it exists as an internal pattern of values of actors in the sector (Barley & Tolbert, 1997; Powell, 1991; Scott, 2001). It is not easily questioned or compared against any alternatives and is still taken for granted even by arts marketing writers and practitioners. Under this circumstance, it is the marketing concept itself that has been adjusted in order to adapt to the context of the arts sector: "We should not

attempt to reconstruct them [arts] to suit marketing assumptions: rather, marketing concepts and technologies should be modified to fit their essence” (Hirschman, 1983, p. 54).

The discussion of cultural persistence leads us to deliberate on the “embeddedness” of the market. As Karl Polanyi (1944) has argued insightfully, the market is embedded in the political and socio-cultural contexts of society. That is, capitalist markets could emerge only after relevant normative consensus and state policies were made, and state intervention is still essential in solving social problems the market system inevitably causes. The market is also influenced and constrained by ongoing social relations and institutions such as trust, networks, norms and beliefs (Granovetter, 1985; Powell & DiMaggio, 1991). The notion of embeddedness informs us that the market exists as a part of broader society and is embodied within its conditions, which consequently challenges the myth of the free and self-regulating market.⁵

In a similar vein, this paper argues that marketing is deeply nested within specific contexts of sectors. This is why marketing theory, which assumes the existence of the free market and sovereign consumers, produces semantic and logical confusion when it explains the real world of marketing activity and, what is more, when it extends itself to non-commercial sectors where normative factors are more influential. As has been seen earlier, it is mainstream marketing literature that has provided arts marketing with sources of the compromise and thus the contradiction, for example, through providing a variety of modified definition of marketing and slippery use of language. By doing so marketing theorists try to make marketing applicable to all types of social activities, but instead this heats unceasing debates around the identity, definition and domain of marketing itself: e.g. “are all human exchange relationships marketing if marketing is human exchange relationships?”, “is marketing outside the marketplace still marketing?” or “can non-market-oriented marketing be marketing?” (Arndt, 1978; Brown, 2002; Graham, 1994; Foxall, 1989; Luck, 1969).

The paper suggests that the framework of cultural persistence and the embeddedness of the market is useful for analysis of marketisation of the arts and the development of arts marketing. By drawing our attention to cultural and social construction of the market and marketing, the framework could also produce an effective criticism of free market ideology.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Professor Oliver Bennett and an anonymous referee for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper.

Notes

- ¹ In this paper, institutional change refers to a shift in formal and informal systems such as policy, law, ideology, culture, belief, norm and rule, which influence the way in which individual organisations in a sector should behave (Powell & DiMaggio, 1991; Scott 2001). As to the nature of the change in the British non-profit arts sector since the 1980s, many conceptualisations have been attempted: “marketisation”, “commodification”, “privatisation”, “commercialisation” or “managerialism”. However, “marketisation”

seems to be the most comprehensive notion that refers to the phenomenon that market reasoning became a dominant institutional force in the sector. Other notions are likely to be concerned with particular aspects of marketisation.

- ² The Society of West End Theatres (currently the Society of London Theatres) consisted mainly of commercial theatres with a small number of subsidised theatres.
- ³ ACORN (A Classification of Residential Neighbourhoods) is a manipulation of census data that indicates distinct groups and types based on the housing, age, household and socio-economic character of the population. Using the ACORN data, arts organisations can identify the residential postcodes of their existing and potential audience, and accordingly their profile.
- ⁴ Originally, the first three volumes of the manual were published in 1978, as the *CORT Marketing Manual* by the Council of Regional Theatres, with assistance from the Arts Council. Then, the revised version was published by Theatrical Management Association in 1982, and the fourth volume in 1983.
- ⁵ The concept of embeddedness receives increasing attention in social science disciplines. It generally refers to the boundedness of the market to historical, cultural and social contexts of society, but its use varies depending on how we see the relationships between social relations/institutions and the market and between social relations/institutions and rationality. See Scott (2001).

Works cited

- Andreasen, A. R. (1985) "Marketing or selling the arts: An orientational dilemma", *Journal of Arts Management and Law* **15**(1): 9-19.
- Arndt, J. (1978) "How broad should the marketing concept be?", *Journal of Marketing* **42**(January), 101-103.
- Arnold, M. (1993) *Culture and Anarchy and Other Writings* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge).
- Arts Council England (2003) *Information: Marketing the Arts* (Arts Council England: London).
- Arts Council of Great Britain (1976) *Report on Special Marketing Projects in Sheffield, Bristol and Birmingham* (Arts Council of Great Britain, London).
- Arts Council of Wales (2000) *Planning a Marketing Campaign: Year of the Artist* (Arts Council of Wales, Cardiff).
- Arts Marketing Association (2004) *How Does Your Garden Grow?: Developing Audiences for the Arts* (conference report) (Arts Marketing Association, Cambridge).
- Bagozzi, R. P. (1980) "Marketing as exchange", In: Kotler, P. & Cox, K. eds, *Marketing Management and Strategy: A Reader* (revised edition) (Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ), pp. 49-58.
- Baker, M. J. (1994) "One more time – what is marketing?", In: Baker, M. J., ed, *The Marketing Book* (3rd edition) (Butterworth Heinemann, Oxford), pp. 3-10.
- Barley, S. R. & Tolbert, P. S. (1997) "Institutionalization and structuration: Studying the links between action and institution", *Organization Studies* **18**(1), 93-117.
- Bennett, O. (1996) *Cultural Policy and the Crisis of Legitimacy: Entrepreneurial Answers in the United Kingdom* (Centre for the Study of Cultural Policy, University of Warwick, Coventry).

- Bhrádaigh, E. N. (1997) "Arts marketing: A review of research and issues", In: Fitzgibbon, M. & Kelly, A., eds, *From Maestro to Manager: Critical Issues in Arts and Culture Management* (Oak Tree Press, Dublin), pp. 207-219.
- Boorsma, M. (2002) "Arts marketing and the societal functioning of the arts: The case of the subsidised dramatic arts in the Netherlands", *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 8(1), 5-74.
- Brown, S. (2002) "Vote, vote, vote for Philip Kotler", *European Journal of Marketing* 36(3), 313-324.
- Burke, V. (1980) *Ready for the Eighties?* (Society of West End Theatres, London).
- Butler, P. (2000) "By popular demand: Marketing the arts", *Journal of Marketing Management* 16, 343-364.
- Buttle, F. (1996) "Relationship marketing", In: Buttle, F., ed, *Relationship Marketing: Theory and Practice* (Paul Chapman, London), pp. 1-16.
- Colbert, F. (2001). *Marketing Culture and the Arts* (Presses HEC, Montreal).
- Dalgic, T. (2000) "Market orientation and its implications", In: Blois, K., ed, *The Oxford Textbook of Marketing* (Oxford University Press, Oxford), pp. 20-36.
- Diggle, K. (1976) *Marketing the Arts* (City University, London).
- Diggle, K. (1994) *Arts Marketing* (Rhinegold Publishing, London).
- Foxall, G. (1989) "Marketing's domain", *European Journal of Marketing* 23(8), 7-22.
- Frank, T. (2000) *One Market under God: Extreme Capitalism, Market Populism, and the End of Economic Democracy* (Anchor Books, NY).
- Graham, P. (1994) "Marketing in the public sector: Inappropriate or merely difficult?", *Journal of Marketing Management* 10, 361-375.
- Granovetter, M. (1997[1985]) "Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness", In: Casson, M. ed, *Culture, Social Norms and Economics* (Edgar Elgar, Cheltenham), pp. 142-171.
- Gray, C. (2000) *The Politics of the Arts in Britain* (Macmillan, London).
- Greater London Arts (1989) *Marketing Resource Pack: A Guide to Arts Marketing for Small and Middle Scale Performing Arts Groups* (Greater London Arts, London).
- Grönroos, C. (1989) "Defining marketing: A market-oriented approach", *European Journal of Marketing* 23(1), 52-60.
- Honour, H. (1981) *Romanticism* (Penguin, Harmondsworth).
- Hill, E., O'Sullivan, C. & O'Sullivan, T. (1995) *Creative Arts Marketing* (Butterworth Heinemann, Oxford).
- Hirschman, E. C. (1983) "Aesthetics, ideologies and the limits of the marketing concept", *Journal of Marketing* 47(summer), 45-55.
- Kawashima, N. (2000) *Beyond the Division of Attenders vs. Non-attenders: A Study into Audience Development in Policy and Practice* (Centre for Cultural Policy Studies, University of Warwick, Coventry).

- Keynes, J. M. (2000 [1945]) "The Arts Council: Its policy and hopes", In: Wallinger, M. & Warnock, M. eds, *Art for All?: Their Policies and Our Culture* (Peer, London), pp. 142-143.
- Kolb, B. M. (2000) *Marketing Cultural Organisations: New Strategies for Attracting Audiences to Classical Music, Dance, Museums, Theatre and Opera* (Oak Tree Press, Dublin).
- Kotler, N. & Kotler, P. (1998) *Museum Strategy and Marketing: Designing Missions, Building Audiences, Generating Revenue and Resources* (Jossey-Bass, San Francisco).
- Kotler, N & Kotler, P (1999) "Can museums be all things to all people?: Missions, goals, and marketing's role", *Museum Management and Curatorship* **18**(3), 271-287.
- Kotler, P. (1972) "A generic concept of marketing", *Journal of Marketing* **36**(April), 46-54.
- Kotler, P. (1976) *Marketing Management: Analysis, Planning, and Control* (3rd edition) (Prentice Hall International, London).
- Kotler, P. & Andreasen, A. R. (1991) *Strategic Marketing for Nonprofit Organizations* (4th edition) (Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliff, NJ).
- Kotler, P. & Levy, S. J. (1969) "Broadening the concept of marketing", *Journal of Marketing* **33**(January), 10-15.
- Kotler, P. et al. (1996) *Principles of Marketing* (European edition) (Prentice Hall, London).
- Lee, H.-K. (2005) "Rethinking arts marketing in a changing cultural policy context", *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing* **10**(1) (forthcoming).
- Lewis, J. (1990) *Art, Culture and Enterprise: The Politics of Art and the Cultural Industries* (Routledge, London).
- Lewis, P. (1994) "Museum and marketing", In: Moore, K. ed, *Museum Management* (Routledge, London), pp. 216-231.
- Luck, D. J. (1969) "Broadening the concept of marketing – too far", *Journal of Marketing* **33**(July), 53-55.
- Maitland, H. (1995) *Marketing for Touring: The Golden Guide* (Arts Council of England, London).
- Maitland, H. & Meddick, J. (1990) *The Marketing Manual* (Arts Council of Great Britain, London).
- Maslow, A. H. (1970) *Motivation and Personality* (2nd edition) (Harper & Row, London).
- McGuigan, J. (1996) *Culture and the Public Sphere* (Routledge, London).
- McLean, F. (1993) "Marketing in museum: A contextual analysis", *Museum Management and Curatorship* **12**(1), 11-27.
- McLean, F. (1997) *Marketing the Museum* (Routledge, London).
- Mokwa, M. P., Nakamoto, K. & Enis, B.M. (1980) "Marketing management and the arts", In: Mokwa, M. P., Dawson, W. M., & Prieve, E., eds, *Marketing the Arts* (Praeger, NY), pp. 14-28.
- Mokwa, M. P., Dawson, W.M. & Prieve, E., eds, (1980) *Marketing the Arts* (Praeger, NY).

- O'Sullivan, P. (1997) "Marketing the arts: From paradigm to plan", In: Fitzgibbon, M. & Kelly, A., eds, *From Maestro to Manager: Critical Issues in Arts and Culture Management* (Oak Three Press, Dublin), pp. 139-181.
- Polanyi, K. (1944) *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time* (Beacon, Boston).
- Powell, W. W. (1991) "Expanding the scope of institutional analysis", In: Powell, W. W. & DiMaggio, P. J., eds, *The New Institutionalism in Organisational Analysis* (University of Chicago, Chicago), pp. 183-203.
- Powell, W. W. & DiMaggio, P. J., eds, (1991) *The New Institutionalism in Organisational Analysis* (University of Chicago, Chicago).
- Quinn, R.-B., M. (1998) *Public Policy and the Arts: A Comparative Study of Great Britain and Ireland* (Ashgate, Aldershot).
- Redcliffe-Maud, J. P. (1976) *Support for the Arts in England and Wales* (Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, London).
- Rentschler, R. et al. (2002) "Relationship marketing, audience retention and performing arts organisation viability", *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing* 7(2), 118-130.
- Robbins, G. V. & Verwey, P. (1982) *The TMA Marketing Manual, Volume 1* (Theatrical Management Association, London).
- Rodger, L. W. (1987) *Marketing the Visual Arts: Challenge and Response* (Scottish Arts Council, Edinburgh).
- Sargeant, A. (1999) *Marketing Management for Nonprofit Organization* (Oxford University Press, Oxford).
- Scheff, J. & Kotler, P. (1996) "Crisis in the arts: The marketing response", *California Management Review* 39(1), 28-52.
- Scott, W. R. (2001) *Institutions and Organizations* (Sage, London).
- Scottish Arts Council (2001) *Boost Your Performance: Writing Your Marketing Action Plan* (Scottish Arts Council, Edinburgh).
- Shaw, R. (1987) *The Arts and the People* (Jonathan Cape, London).
- Shiner, L. (2001) *The Invention of Art: A Cultural History* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago)
- Vaughan, W. (1994) *Romanticism and Art* (Thames & Hudson, London)
- Williams, R. (1982) *Culture and Society* (Hogarth Press, London).
- Wyatt, M. (1983) *Marketing Guidelines* (North West Arts, Manchester).